

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to FIGs. 2 and 3.

The first sheet, which includes FIG. 2, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 2. In FIG. 2, the acronyms GS, TS, and MST are expanded into GroupStatus, TreeStatus, and minimum spanning tree, respectively.

The second sheet, which includes FIG. 3, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 3. In FIG. 3, the acronyms GS and TS are expanded into GroupStatus and TreeStatus, respectively.

Attachment: 2 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **11 June 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-25. The drawings were objected to. The abstract is objected to. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 14-21, and 24 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-25 were allowed.

Objections to the drawings

The drawings were objected to for failing to show a descriptive legend for the acronyms: GS, TS, and MST.

Applicant has amended the drawings to address the objections. Applicant has expanded the acronyms GS, TS, and MST in FIGs. 2 and 3 into GroupStatus, TreeStatus, and minimum spanning tree, respectively. These amendments find support on page 4, line 25 to page 5, line 5, of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the specification

The abstract was objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended the abstract to replace the acronyms MCT and MST with “multicast tree (MCT)” and “minimum spanning tree (MST),” respectively, as supported in the abstract of the instant application. Applicant has also amended a paragraph to address a minor grammar issue. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the claims

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 14-21, and 24 were objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended the claims in accordance with the changes that were required by the Examiner.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5-6, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, and 20 to remove the phrase “configured to.”

Applicant respectfully points out that claim 21 describes the structure of an apparatus in one embodiment of the instant invention. The elements in the apparatus are illustrated in FIG. 1. The phrase “configured to” in claim 21 describes the functionality of the elements in the apparatus, and does not make the claim negative. See *In Re Alappat* (33. F.3d 1526), where the court rejected an argument by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences that claim 15 of *Alappat* (a means-plus-function apparatus claim) as nothing more than process claims. The Court in *Alappat* used the phrase “configured to” while construing claim 15 of *Alappat* to be a machine or apparatus (see *Alappat*, 1540-1541, 1570).

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5 to clarify that the routing tree membership status of each given node in the path from the new node to the final node is set equal to the specified group membership status of the new node. These amendments find support in FIG. 2 and page 13, lines 1 to 19, of the instant application.

Applicant has amended claims 6 and 11 to replace “the request” with “the first request” and hence satisfy antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended claims 6 and 11 to clarify that the *TreeStatus* of each given node in the minimum spanning tree between the new node and the last peer examined is set equal to the *GroupStatus* of the new node. This amendment finds support in FIG. 2 and page 13, lines 1 to 19, of the instant application.

Applicant has amended claims 6-7, 9-11, 15-17, 19, and 24 to restate limitations as steps and hence make the claims clear.

Applicant has amended claim 16 to clarify that said repeating is the repeating of steps (a) to steps (f) described in line 6 of claim 15. This amendment finds support in FIG. 3 and page 14, lines 15 to 21, of the instant application.

Applicant has amended claim 18 to clarify that the limitation in step (d) is if the number of local ports is equal to zero. This amendment finds support in FIG. 3 of the instant application.

Applicant has amended claim 19 to clarify that a given node that was most recently added to the queue is dequeued to be the current node. This amendment finds support on page 10, from line 25 to line 26, of the instant application.

In summary, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 14-20, and 24 in accordance with the changes that were required by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-4, which depend upon claim 1, claims 7-10, which depend upon claim 6, claim 13, which depends upon claim 12, claim 16, which depends upon claim 15, claim 19, which depends upon claim 18, and claims 22-25, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony P. Jones/
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 1 August 2007

Anthony Jones
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com